



SR 167 Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Wednesday, March 30, 2022

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Zoom

Technical Advisory Group members in attendance:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brianne Bannwarth, City of Renton | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cecile Malik, City of Auburn |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Barnes, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeremy Metzler, City of Edgewood |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chad Bieren, City of Kent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leticia Neal, Pierce County |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kacie Bray, Auburn Area Chamber of Commerce | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Paine, City of Kent |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rob Brown, City of Kent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Pierson, Tacoma Pierce County Chamber of Commerce |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lora Butterfield, Fife Milton Edgewood Chamber of Commerce | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geri Poor, Port of Seattle |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric Chipps, Sound Transit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carl See, Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Davies, City of Puyallup | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lynsey Sehmel, Pierce Transit |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ingrid Gaub, City of Auburn | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Sietz, City of Renton |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reema Griffith, Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angie Stahlnecker, City of Milton |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aaron Halbert, Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Darin Stavish, Pierce Transit |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hans Hunger, City of Puyallup | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jacob Sweeting, City of Auburn |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owen Kehoe, King County Metro | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Tomporowski, City of SeaTac |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Kosa, City of Sumner | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ryan Windish, City of Sumner |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cyndy Knighton, City of Tukwila | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christine Wolf, Northwest Seaport Alliance and Port of Tacoma |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew Leach, City of Sumner | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric Wright, Washington Trucking Associations |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sharon Love, FHWA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Yaghoobi, City of Pacific |

Presenters and project team members in attendance:

- Chris Breiland, SR 167 Master Plan
- Amy Danberg, SR 167 Master Plan
- April Delchamps, SR 167 Master Plan
- Rob Fellows, WSDOT
- Loreana Marciante, SR 167 Master Plan
- Robin Mayhew, SR 167 Master Plan
- Jeff Storrar, SR 167 Master Plan
- Wendy Taylor, SR 167 Master Plan
- Karl Westby, SR 167 Master Plan
- Henry Yates, SR 167 Master Plan

Meeting objectives:

- Report out on existing conditions
- Provide community engagement update
- Report out on initial project list feedback
- Introduce and discuss scenario development



Introduction

Amy Danberg, SR 167 Master Plan Communications, facilitated introductions and reviewed ground rules for the meeting. April Delchamps, Planning Manager, provided the official welcome and reviewed the objectives for the meeting.

Planning steps and partner meeting schedule

April Delchamps, Planning Manager, reviewed the planning steps and partner meeting schedule. She reiterated that this Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting is the third of seven meetings and there are four additional meetings. As discussed previously, the planning study process happens in 5 phases. She explained that each phase has overlap and that broad timelines were provided for each phase. April provided a status update that Phase 2 is wrapping up and Phase 3 is at the midpoint. Phase 4 is just starting. She further explained Phase 3 is focused on developing and screening projects and strategies, and Phase 4 is focused on developing and evaluating multimodal, multi-agency scenarios. This summer we expect to host several co-creation community forums with the communities up and down the corridor to get detailed input on the scenarios.

April also reviewed engagement with the Technical Advisory Committee, Equity Advisory Committee, and Policy Advisory Committee that has been completed, is underway, or is planned in each of these phases. A theme you will see throughout the Master Plan process and carrying forward to implementation is partnership.

Robin Mayhew, Management of Mobility Director, shared an update on internal WSDOT coordination across all the studies and projects in this geographic area. She noted Olympic Region is kicking off the SR 512 study and will kick off the South Pierce County Corridor study soon. She reviewed the good news following this legislative session that the Puget Sound Gateway Program and the I-405/SR 167 Corridor Program received full funding. She also noted the Tacoma to Puyallup Regional Trail received full funding.

Existing and Future Baseline Report Summary

Chris Breiland, SR 167 Master Plan Project Manager, provided a summary of the Existing and Future Baseline Report. He noted April emailed the report out to the Technical Advisory Committee on March 18. He shared the comment period for the report ends on April 1.

He also provided an overview of how we will use this data. The data is fundamental to our scenario development process. It shows the opportunities and constraints to mobility across the study area and opportunities and constraints to investing in projects and strategies to improve mobility.

- Data is pre-pandemic data
- Highlight key take-aways from each chapter in about a minute or less

Community engagement

Amy Danberg, SR 167 Master Plan Community and Partner Engagement lead, provided an update on partner and community engagement communications. She reminded the group of their overarching approach to community and partner engagement, and then provided an update on the engagement-to-date, what the project team has heard, and what is coming up.

She shared since the last TAC meeting, the project team hosted the first Equity Advisory Committee (EAC) meeting and Henry Yates, the EAC facilitator, will provide an update on the feedback heard at that meeting. She noted the team is preparing for an online open house this spring and that she was looking



to the TAC members to help share and encourage engagement in the online open house from their communities.

Amy reviewed the upcoming proposed meeting dates for the TAC, Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), and EAC. She also reviewed the final key themes of what the project team heard from the listening session work. She also thanked members of the TAC who provided additional contacts for community-based organizations within the corridor. Two of those groups have been added to the EAC membership.

Amy turned it over to Henry to recap the feedback from the first Equity Advisory Committee meeting.

Equity Advisory Committee update

Henry Yates, SR 167 Master Plan Equity Advisory Committee Facilitator, reviewed the feedback from the first meeting.

Key pieces of feedback on the **study goals included:**

- Consider engaging subject matter experts, such as blind people, people using wheelchairs, deaf people, etc., to evaluate the effectiveness of WSDOT's proposed solutions.
- Any project that is providing more roadway capacity is also going to induce demand. How do we get to the Environment Goal (greenhouse gas emissions/environmental impacts) in a substantive way?
- The goals would be improved if Networking/Connecting with active mobility facilities were included in the list (interconnectivity between modes).
- 43 percent of people in the study area are Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC). Make sure that the data includes the income of the growing group of people moving south (lower income people of color) because the BIPOC families and the low-income families are no longer able to afford to live in Seattle. WSDOT mentioned BIPOC communities moving south, and how that trend is going to continue. The data-driven approach to WSDOT's work should include the economic trend of the people moving south and how that income/audience will increase in the coming years. The data being used should reflect these changes as much as possible.

Henry also reviewed the feedback on the **Community Profile**, which included how it is important to include people without housing in the analysis because various organizations on the Equity Advisory Committee represent homeless populations. The EAC also mentioned the United Way may be a good resource for calculating people living without housing.

He reviewed the feedback on the **Minority Population map**. He noted the mobility disparities will look different between Asians and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders (NHPI) with NHPIs bearing the greatest disparities within the Asian and NHPI subgroup.

Henry shared the EAC's feedback on the **Limited English Proficiency Population map**, which included how the map would benefit from including literacy levels because some people may not know English and may also not be literate in their native language. The EAC also noted the map area around the Port of Tacoma and State Route 161 might be skewed because people do not live in these areas.

He shared the EAC's feedback on the Foreign-Born Population map, which included engage the Sikh community to ensure they are represented in data.

Henry reviewed what the SR 167 Master Plan team shared with the EAC which included census-driven data in relation to the SR 167 Master Plan Study Area; plans for future EAC member involvement, including an opportunity to share information presented at EAC meetings with constituents; EAC members have unlimited access to WSDOT and consultant staff between EAC meetings, and the commitment to address each item noted at the EAC meetings.



Equity Advisory Committee takeaways

Henry also provided details on the SR 167 Master Plan team's key takeaways from the first EAC meeting. The takeaways included how different communities have different levels of engagement and understanding of the SR 167 Master Plan process. There is a need to interact more with some of the communities that have not been a part of transportation planning work previously. The study area is dynamic, and we will learn about current trends and concerns from community members throughout the SR 167 Master Plan process.

Henry wrapped up by sharing how the SR 167 Master Plan team is seeking insights from EAC members. Those key insights included issues members are aware of related to equity and community engagement that WSDOT has not recognized. Confirmation of issues WSDOT has identified if the EAC members also recognize them as issues. Lastly, sharing any community outreach approaches members or their community-based organizations have implemented that they believe have been especially successful in reaching their constituents.

Christine Wolf, Northwest Seaport Alliance, commented in the chat regarding the population map that some of the maps in the draft show populations in the MICs where there is little or no housing.

Chris Breiland, SR 167 Master Plan Project Manager, responded the data will get somewhat skewed if you take the whole manufacturing and industrial center (MIC) and apply that to a smaller population that's around the fringe of it. And we don't want to lose the data for the people who are there.

Screened Project List Update

April Delchamps provided an update on the screened project list. She noted the initial step of the scenario development process was to review approved and published project lists and apply a first screening. The first screening determined if the project was within the study area and if the project or strategy has the potential for improving mobility along the SR 167 corridor. The initial screened project and strategy list was sent to the TAC for review after the January meeting. This work allows us to include any funded or soon to be constructed projects in the near-to-midterm in our baseline analysis.

The SR 167 Master Plan team received considerable feedback via the survey, briefings with individual agencies, and emails. April thanked the committee members for their time and energy reviewing and responding to the survey.

April further explained the feedback was evaluated and grouped based on type. Many of the comments were focused on small edits and additional information such as comments on updating the project description; updating funding status; identifying completed, soon to be completed, and upcoming construction projects; indicating potential partnerships and needed steps; indicating duplicative projects; and flagging projects as having a safety component. Other comments were more substantial including deleting projects that are no longer planned and new projects.

April noted that the team is finalizing the project list updates and will follow-up on the comments and feedback in the coming weeks.

April also shared the second screening will use the updated project and strategy list as the starting point. The team will qualitatively rate projects and strategies against all the goals except the Practical Solutions and State of Good Repair goal as this evaluation is not cost constrained. Projects will not be phased in the second screening. The team's objective is to provide a 1 to 4 rating on how well the project or strategy advances the goal so that we can identify potential candidate projects/strategies for the five scenarios.



Scenario development

April Delchamps re-oriented everyone to the SR 167 Master Plan process and how each step and feedback loop builds off and informs the next. The first two meetings and listening sessions focused on three key tasks in the process, the vision, the goals supported by the needs, and the metrics. Feedback was essential to these steps and will now inform the scenario development.

She reviewed the vision and how it has been updated to reflect multiple rounds of feedback and was presented at the last Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting where discussion indicated overwhelming support. She also shared, similarly, the updated goals were presented and endorsed at the last PAC meeting with comments supporting the process and updated goals.

April then reviewed the metrics and that they had been shared at the last TAC meeting and presented in a summary format at the PAC. The SR 167 Master Plan team received considerable feedback on the metrics from many partners, many of which had interest in either expanding the number of metrics or refining the metric for a more specific evaluation related to their interest. She noted the team made some refinements, but we couldn't accommodate all the requests for change without generating an overly complex set of metrics. April turned the conversation over to Chris to go over the next steps in scenario development and the role of the final metrics.

Scenario development timeline

Chris Breiland, SR 167 Master Plan Project Manager, shared we are at a critical point in the Master Plan process, which is the development of scenarios to test. He began by sharing how the scenarios will be used over the next few months. He noted the team is currently creating five scenarios and will share the evaluation of those five scenarios in June. Over the summer, the team will narrow the scenarios down to three. Finally, the team will develop, analyze, and narrow the scenarios through the rest of the year to develop a final recommendation.

He then provided an overview of the next few months. We've gone through Screening #1 where we were answering the question about whether the project or strategy is within the study area. He noted we are in the middle of Screening #2. We will apply the second screening, refine the project list, and conduct a qualitative review for each goal by using the reviewed metrics. The team will develop the Scenarios using the Screening #2 info, existing conditions data, and principles and themes.

Scenario purpose

Chris described the purpose of the scenarios. The scenarios organize the 200-plus projects identified in earlier phases; test outcomes and progress toward the goals under deliberately different investment decisions; understand the types of projects and combinations that transform transportation in the corridor (as measured by the metrics); and provide information to help refine to a smaller set of scenarios that will be subject to more detailed analysis. Chris noted it is important to understand that these scenarios are a means to test and understand impacts as we seek to narrow towards a recommendation.

Chris then explained where the Scenarios came from. The development of the initial five scenario themes were informed by the vision, goals, and metrics. They were also informed by three key principles - the scenarios needed to be multimodal, multiagency, and advance the goals for the Master Plan. He also noted the scenarios needed to have varying levels of multimodal capacity expansion on and off SR 167 and varying levels of demand and system management.

He then reviewed the key questions he was looking for the TAC members to answer over the coming weeks:

- Do the themes cover the broad range of options you would expect?
- Do you see your interests being able to fit into one or more of the themes?



- Are the themes helpful to organize projects and strategies, are there things we are missing?

Chris introduced the scenario themes and reviewed the potential type of projects that would roll up into each theme.

1. **Baseline:** Complete the fully funded projects within the study area
2. **Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO):** Efficiency and traffic management; complementary multimodal projects
3. **Centers:** Demand management and multimodal access improvements to and within designated centers
4. **Express Toll Lanes + Transit:** SR 167 express toll lanes with expanded transit; complementary multimodal projects
5. **Strategic Capacity:** Refreshed look at the 2008 Corridor Master Plan with complementary multimodal projects

He then asked the TAC members the following questions:

- Is there anything we're missing?
- Do you see your interest represented in one or many of the themes?

Christine Wolf, Northwest Seaport Alliance, asked regarding performance metrics, how are we evaluating mode switches? Further, evaluating scenarios with current performance metrics, is there a more qualitative filter or more overarching quantitative filter that would be applied with the analysis? Chris Breiland recognized that there's a few trip purposes and few types of trips that cannot shift their modes, and in some cases are restricted on the facilities that they can operate on, and we have some performance metrics that will see to isolate those trips.

Carl See, Washington State Transportation Commission, commented that he thinks it does help to frame up some of the distinctions here between the different themes. He noted regarding the ETL plus transit theme that a portion of the SR 167 corridor is not ETLs, but fully tolled. He wondered if the theme should be retitled "Tolling plus transit." Chris Breiland responded that is great feedback and I think that's a good reminder to us all that the corridor is not just the part that's there today.

Eric Chipps, Sound Transit, asked if the baseline scenario is consistent with the baseline report? Chris Breiland responded yes. It's the funded projects in the report. Eric went on to ask about whether the scenarios are mutually exclusive and why we wouldn't produce a scenario that has all black dots across the goals – meets all of the needs. Chris replied things are not mutually exclusive, we are trying to balance between being aspirational/not financially constrained and being realistic with environmental, land use, and cost considerations.

Jim Seitz, City of Renton, noted he found the I-405 cost-benefit analysis helpful in planning for future improvements and that he hoped that same approach would be utilized in the SR 167 Master Plan Study. He specifically noted scenario 5 related to strategic capacity. Chris shared that we will be getting to some level of the cost-benefit analysis, but we are not at that point in the study. Jim went on to say the elected officials appreciated seeing the cost-benefit analysis as well because it is a more objective way of looking at things.

Next steps

April closed the meeting by sharing the next Equity Advisory Committee meeting is on April 22, and the next Policy Advisory Committee is scheduled for May 4. The focus of the next TAC meeting will be reviewing and discussing the scenario analysis. Additionally, community outreach is planned between Meeting 4 and Meeting 5 of the TAC and PAC.



She also noted there are multiple engagement and technical tasks planned for the second quarter of 2022. The draft Existing and Future Baseline Conditions report detailed earlier is currently out for TAC comment. Comments are due by Friday, April 1. There are two requests for TAC comments planned in the next six weeks.

1. The TAC comment period for the scenario themes shared earlier will run from Friday, April 1 to Friday, April 15.
2. The comment period for the rated project list (the post screening #2 list) and the five scenarios with projects/strategies is anticipated in early May.

The SR 167 Team is currently planning for an online open house and survey that is anticipated to start in April.

The meeting was adjourned.